

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Administration of the)	CC Docket No. 99-237
North American Numbering)	
Plan)	
)	
Numbering Resource Optimization)	CC Docket No. 99-200
)	
North American Numbering Plan)	DA 02-1412
Administration Technical Requirements)	
Document)	

COMMENTS OF TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES

Louise L. M. Tucker
Attorney for Telcordia Technologies
2020 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 530-8934
ltucker@telcordia.com

Dated: July 2, 2002

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction and Summary	1
II.	Asset Transfer	2
III.	Change Management	7
IV.	State Regulatory Interface	11
V.	System-to-System Requirements	16
VI.	Section-by-Section Comments	19
Appendix A		A-1

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Administration of the)	CC Docket No. 99-237
North American Numbering)	
Plan)	
)	
Numbering Resource Optimization)	CC Docket No. 99-200
)	
North American Numbering Plan)	DA 02-1412
Administration Technical Requirements)	
Document)	

COMMENTS OF TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES

Introduction and Summary

Telcordia Technologies (Telcordia) is pleased to have the opportunity to review and offer comments to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) on the technical requirements which will form the basis for a solicitation pursuant to the Federal Acquisitions Regulations (FAR) for the North American Numbering Plan Administrator's (NANPA's) next term of administration.¹ Telcordia shares the Commission's desire to ensure that the NANPA procurement process is fair and maximizes value to the Commission and the telecommunications industry. The importance of the NANPA's role is recognized by statute and placed in the

¹ *The Wireline Competition Bureau Seeks Comments on the North American Numbering Plan Administrator Technical Requirements*, Public Notice, DA 02-1412 (rel. June 13, 2002).

Commission's sole jurisdiction.² Telcordia offers the following comments in the spirit of providing complete information to assist the Commission in transforming the technical requirements into a solicitation document that enables thorough and fair bidding by all qualified parties.

Proper resolution of four key issues is crucial to ensure that the solicitation is practical, fair, unambiguous, and competitive, and results in an outcome that is durable over the contract period. First, a precise inventory and identification of the ownership of existing NANPA Intellectual Property assets, and the assurance of equal access to all NANPA Intellectual Property for all potential bidders is imperative to ensure an impartial procurement. Second, the requirements regarding change during the contract term must be complete, clear and unambiguous. Third, the new NANPA's state regulatory interface activities must be clarified to ensure appropriate cost recovery for the winning bidders. Fourth, the system-to-system requirements should contain more precise interface specifications and should be modified to permit bidders to propose the most innovative solutions. Following the discussion of these four key issues are specific comments on individual sections of the requirements document that do not relate to these four issues. Finally, in Appendix A, we provide specific section-by-section comments on how these four issues affect the technical requirements document.

II. Asset Transfer

The technical requirements document does not address the systems, hardware, software, and other assets the current NANPA will transfer to its successor during the transition period. Yet precise and complete information regarding the transfer of such assets is crucial to achieve

² 47 U.S.C. § 251(e).

the FAR's goals of delivering "the best value" and "promoting competition,"³ and to ensure that the telecommunications industry does not pay for NANPA hardware or software twice.

The FCC anticipated this need by requiring assets to be identified and transferred to a successor NANPA. Section 52.13 of the existing FCC rules that govern NANPA's responsibilities states:

NANPA must make available any and all intellectual property and associated hardware resulting from its activities as numbering administrator including, but not limited to, systems and the data contained therein, software, interface specifications and supporting documentation and make such property available to whomever NANC directs free of charge. The new NANPA must specify any intellectual property it proposes to exclude from the provisions of this paragraph based on the existence of such property prior to its selection as NANPA. 47 C.F.R. 52.13.

To the best of our knowledge, the current NANPA did not notify the original Selection Committee or the Commission that it intended to exclude certain software or hardware from its transfer obligation. In response to an inquiry on this subject forwarded to the Common Carrier Bureau from the NANC in March of 2000⁴, the Bureau Chief stated, "if another entity succeeds NeuStar, the current NANPA, we expect that all systems used and developed for numbering administration functions, including all intellectual property and associated hardware as described above, would transfer to the new entity free of charge."⁵ If the upcoming NANPA solicitation is treated similarly to that prepared for the Pooling Administration activity, bidders will be expected to provide detailed descriptions as to how their proposals will comply with the various provisions of the technical requirements document. Unless competing bidders know exactly which systems will be transferred, their source code(s), their hardware requirements, their capacities and capabilities, the extent to which they currently comply with the new requirements,

³ 48 C.F.R. § 1.102(a), (b)(iii). *See also* 48 C.F.R. §1.102-2(c) (establishing as a performance standard for federal acquisitions to conduct business with "integrity, fairness, and openness").

⁴ Letter from John R. Hoffman, NANC Chair, to Lawrence E. Strickling, Common Carrier Bureau Chief, March 21, 2000.

whether they are upgradeable, and whether they are compatible with other systems, the preparation of such descriptions becomes an impossible task.⁶ This level of specificity is not provided by the Bureau Chief's letter, the rule, or the technical requirements document.

Absent this crucial information, other bidders will be severely disadvantaged in responding to the solicitation. For example, because Telcordia is not a user of NANP resources, it is (appropriately) denied access to the current Code Administration System (CAS) system. As such, Telcordia cannot assess the current capabilities of that system. The only resource available to Telcordia is an outdated version of the CAS Requirements Document (version 4.3s), which is dated February 23, 2000 — almost a year and a half before the system was placed into service. That document was written to provide a systems engineer with basic information on how the system will be accessed and used, but not the type of current information needed by systems analysts to determine the adequacy of its configuration, algorithms, capacities or fault tolerance mechanisms for the current situation. For example, the document contains no information whatsoever on reporting capabilities, other than an indication that this is handled through the use of “an integrated third-party tool.”⁷ In addition, there is also uncertainty regarding what, if any, ownership rights will be retained by NeuStar. This issue also is not addressed in the technical requirements. Such information is absolutely critical to other bidders in pricing their proposals, as well as determining their rights to modify and enhance certain systems to accommodate any new set of requirements.

⁵ Response from Lawrence E. Strickling to John R. Hoffman, June 7, 2000.

⁶ At minimum, the information provided should conform to Section 7.16 of the technical requirements.

⁷ NeuStar NANPA Center Code Administration System (CAS) Requirements Specification, version 4.3s, Section 3.2.9.

Telcordia believes that the current NANPA is utilizing fully or partially automated systems to perform the following functions: (1) central office code administration, (2) Number Plan Area (NPA) relief planning, (3) NPA exhaust projections, and (4) NRUF report processing and document distribution. Since these systems were developed or acquired to support NeuStar's discharge of its responsibilities as the NANPA, we believe that they are governed by Section 52.13 of the Rules, and potential successors should have a right to preview their functionality, source code, interface, hardware requirements, and all documentation prior to submitting their proposals.

To permit meaningful bidding by entities other than the incumbent, specific information must be provided, at a minimum, for these systems and any others used by the current NANPA related to the following requirements (identified by their corresponding section of the technical requirements):

- 2.13 Data Security
- 2.13.1 Limited Access
- 2.17 Interfaces
- 5.2 Client Notification
- 6.1.8 Data Aggregation
- 6.3.2 Minimum Analysis Requirements
- 7.1 System Characteristics
- 7.1.1 System Availability
- 7.1.2 System Query Capability
- 7.1.3 System Scalability
- 7.2 System Capabilities
- 7.4 System Data
- 7.4.1 Data Integrity
- 7.4.2 Confidential Treatment
- 7.4.3 Automated Submittal
- 7.4.4 Automated Data Output Capabilities
- 7.5 System Maintenance
- 7.6 System Security
- 7.7 System Client Profile Application
- 7.7.1 User Logon System
- 7.7.2 Logon System Access
- 7.7.3 Logon System Approval

7.7.4	Logon System Security Level
7.7.5	Logon System Password
7.7.6	Logon System Problems
7.7.7	Client User Access Permission Classes
7.7.9	Unauthorized System Access
7.9	System Report Administration
7.10.1	Contact
7.11	System Generated Notifications
7.11.1	Customized Notifications
7.12	System Testing
7.13	System Disaster Recovery
7.14	System Backup
7.18.1	Exhaust Forecasting
7.18.6	CIC Access and Usage Report Processing
7.19.4	Availability and Access
7.19.5	System Responsiveness
7.19.6	Out of Service

Such information should be added to Section 2.14 (Implementation Plan), which specifies the new contractor's responsibilities to help ensure a seamless continuance of service from the previous term of administration to the new one, and provide a common basis for all bidders to use in developing their technical and cost proposals.

In summary, if the asset transfers are not to occur or if detailed specifications for these assets are not made available to all potential bidders -- in advance of the preparation of their proposals -- the non-incumbent bidders will be competitively disadvantaged. These non-incumbent bidders will have to make pricing assumptions for the design and development of entirely new systems that will cause their prices to be significantly higher than the incumbent's -- an unfair and anti-competitive situation. Appendix A provides section-by-section comments on this topic (and the other three topics discussed in these comments) where particular concern is raised.

II. Change Management

A clear understanding of the conditions and process under which changes to the national contract during its term will and will not be allowed is essential to all potential bidders to formulate the pricing of bids. However, several sections of the Requirements that address change management and modification of guidelines seem to be incomplete, unclear or somewhat contradictory. In particular, Telcordia recommends that the solicitation clearly distinguish between changes caused by regulatory directives and those caused by industry guideline changes, and clarify the required procedures and timing for implementing each type of change. The Commission also should correct some faulty cross-references in the requirements document, described below.

One primary issue is the lack of a section specifying how to submit a change in scope of the contract due to industry or regulatory decisions. The section that seems to be intended to address the issue, Section 11.4 - Changes to Scope of Work, notes:

The NANPA vendor may request additional funding for services that are a change in scope from the functions, requirements identified within this document.

The NANPA will follow the process as identified in Section 14.1 to seek additional funding to cover the costs associated with providing added services to its client.

Unfortunately, there is no Section 14 or 14.1 in the Requirements Document.

Further, Section 10.6 simply notes: “The contractor shall provide a Change Management Plan per Section 4.1 within 90 days of contract award.” However, Section 4.1 applies only to the CO Code administration, and guidelines and regulatory directives may occur that require changes to other portions of the NANPA’s systems and procedures, such as Utilization and Forecasting (Section 6) or Reporting (Section 8).

Section 10.7 notes, “The contractor shall provide a Contract Change Management Plan per Section 2.11 within 90 days of contract award.” However, Section 2.11 is the Audits section,

and we presume that the correct reference is to Section 2.10 - Modification of Guidelines. If our presumption is correct, however, we note that Section 2.10 makes no mention of the Contract Change Management Plan mentioned as a Contract Deliverable in Section 10. The Commission may want to include such a requirement in the appropriate section of the document.

In addition, there is some lack of clarity in several of the sections regarding NANPA input into the change process and the timing of changes.

Section 2.10 stipulates that:

- NANPA shall:
- Provide, in real time, technical guidance to ensure processes and procedures are effective in meeting the goals of the change
- Assess and share in real time the cost implications and administrative impact upon the NANPA duties and responsibilities
- Provide contributions, describing how it benefits the NANP and how it shall affect NANPA's duties, obligations or accountability.

Telcordia believes that the NANPA should provide the guidance in the first bullet for all issues and contributions to the INC that it generates, and that it should also provide assistance to the INC and regulators in achieving the goals of number optimization. The scope of this bullet seems unnecessarily broad, however, by possibly requiring NANPA to support a contributor's individual issues and contributions that are beyond the NANPA's own mission and scope. In addition, the duty represented by the second bullet may not always be reasonably achievable, since it is nearly impossible to assess in real time all cost and administrative impacts of proposed changes. Rather, NANPA's duty should be to assess and share relative impacts of proposed changes (e.g., high, medium or low) on NANPA's systems and procedures and those cost and administrative implications that it is able to identify at a given time. Finally, the last bullet could improperly be interpreted as requiring NANPA to support all proposed issues and guideline changes whether or not benefits to the NANP are evident.

Section 2.10 continues:

Clients shall be consulted regarding the suggested implementation date to determine if the impact upon service provider processes and systems is not unduly burdensome or unfairly disadvantages to any service provider or group of service providers per the NANPA's obligations and NANP administrative principles.

Telcordia supports the concept of taking into consideration industry input as to the scope and necessary implementation interval of modifications to the guidelines and NANPA's systems and procedures. However, the first paragraph in Section 2.10 requires NANPA to make regulatory changes effective when they are released -- in essence, immediately. Telcordia recommends that the requirement be altered to implement guideline changes on their effective date rather than on the release date. Given this concern with impact, the implementation date should perhaps be further modified to acknowledge that an additional (brief) delay may be appropriate in given circumstances because NANPA may not have sufficient time to consult with service providers as to the impact of the proposed changes.

Section 4.1 (in Section 4 on CO Code Administration) provides:

NANPA shall create a Change Management Plan for adapting the CO Code assignment practices in accordance with updates and modifications to the CO Code (NXX) Assignment Guidelines and regulatory directives. When there are changes, NANPA shall institute a training program to educate all CO Code Administration staff in order to ensure consistent application. Training shall be completed within five business days of the date the change to the guidelines becomes effective.

Absent a change in the current language of Section 2.10, NANPA would be required to implement the new procedure for regulatory directives immediately, when they are released, thereby precluding the possibility of training in advance. Another disparity results from the fact that NANPA is not required to complete its impact assessment until 7 days after the release of the change, thereby making it nearly impossible to design, implement and complete training within the shorter, five-day period specified.

Section 4.2.1 - Client Services, states:

NANPA shall notify its clients and interested parties when industry guidelines or applicable regulatory directives have changed. NANPA shall provide electronic notification of administrative process and procedural changes within five business days of the change being identified by NANPA. Implementation of these changes shall entail a transition period before the new process or procedure becomes effective.

This requirement gives NANPA a duty to notify the industry of changes in five days when it is not required to have given the FCC and NANC an assessment of the changes for seven days. Additionally since Section 4 applies only to CO Codes, clarification is needed as to whether these requirements only apply to the CO Code administration responsibilities of the NANPA, or the administration of all NAP resources. Telcordia recommends that the foregoing time periods be made consistent, or that the requirement be clarified to state that the notification takes place after any change in scope and resultant system changes are scheduled.

Telcordia is concerned that the provisions regarding Reports to Regulatory authorities provide insufficient FCC input into a process that could result in significant costs to national numbering administration. Section 8.2.2 provides:

NANPA shall produce a list of all standardized NRUF data reports offered to clients. The NANPA and state regulatory commissions shall meet annually to determine the reports' format and content. These reports shall be produced by the NANPA upon demand by an appropriate regulatory authority, and at no cost to the requestor. Agreed-upon changes or modifications to these reports shall be at no cost to the requestor.

Because the requirements specify that "agreed-upon changes or modifications to these reports shall be at no cost to the requestor," Telcordia is concerned that parameters must be placed around the permissible extent of such changes. As the contracting agency, the FCC ultimately must retain control over the scope of work within the contract, and cannot expect the contracting entity to negotiate in a meaningful sense with another governmental body to determine the scope. That determination ultimately must be made by the FCC, based on input from NANPA and the other regulators. Telcordia is concerned that even if changes to the reports' content are so significant as to be deemed a change to the scope of work, NANPA

cannot, under this language, seek to recover such additional cost. When provided, the change in scope section should note this exception if it was so intended.

Finally, Section 9.2.3 - Performance Problems and Corrective Action, notes that “NANPA shall implement remedial action, at no cost to its clients, to correct any identified performance problems.” The term “performance problems” seems vague, and should be replaced with more specific language, such as “deficiencies in performing current requirements.” Remedial action provided at no cost should be limited to remediation necessary because of a failure to meet the terms of the contract as represented by the requirements (including the version of the guidelines effective at the time of the solicitation publication) and the winning vendor’s proposal as accepted by the Commission. All other performance improvements that would otherwise qualify as a change in scope should be treated under Section 11.4 as such.

In summary, Telcordia recommends that the FCC flesh out the section of the Requirements Document concerning change in scope to the contract, distinguish between changes caused by regulatory directives and those caused by industry guideline changes, and clarify the procedures in the requirement for implementation of each type of change.. Appendix A provides section-by-section analysis on this topic where such suggested changes could be made.

III. State Regulatory Interface

National Contract Requirements and Enterprise Services

The Requirements Document mandates specific requirements of the NANPA with regard to its interface with the State Regulatory Commissions. It is not always clear whether a service provided to State Regulatory Commissions is mandatory enterprise service or a service required

under the national contract. A clear understanding of how these activities are to be handled, and whether they are to be executed under the terms of the national contract or an enterprise agreement, would be most helpful. In this regard, Telcordia offers several comments and requests clarification of some of the applicable requirements.

Experience has shown that certain requirements regarding NANPA interface activities with the numerous State Regulatory Commissions have the potential to cause significant costs to the NANPA. Telcordia believes that it is best to be clear up front about these requirements, their inherent costs, and the related billing arrangements in order to limit misunderstandings and/or delays when services are requested by the State Regulatory Commissions in the future.

The introductory paragraph of Section 2 states that “this document encompasses a national contract.” This statement characterizes the scope of the Requirements Document. In this context, Telcordia understands that some NANPA requirements with regard to interfacing with State Commissions are nationally uniform and are stated as such in the Requirements Document. For example, Section 8.2.2 states, with regard to standardized NRUF data reports, that “the NANPA and the state regulatory commissions shall meet annually to determine the reports’ format and content.” Consequently, it is further stated that the NANPA shall generate these uniform reports “at no cost to the requestor [Commission]”. Also, Section 8.6 Requests for Additional Reports states “NANPA may also be requested to produce additional reports as needed by its clients. NANPA may create and provide data in different formats to accommodate requests to cull data and provide customized reports for a fee that is reasonable and based on its costs. See Section H.” Section H cannot be found in the requirements document. Is provision of the additional reports intended to be an enterprise service? If it is, it should be referenced as such and included in the Enterprise Service Section of the requirements (Section 11).

This approach is utilized in the Requirements Document. Both Sections 2.17.5 and 5.1.10 state that NANPA costs as the result of testifying at regulatory hearings “shall/should be treated as enterprise services.” Telcordia’s concern is that although these two Sections direct that this requirement “shall/should” be treated as an enterprise service, it is not included as a Required Enterprise Service in Section 11.2 of the Requirements Document. Consequently, Telcordia believes that it would be consistent with the requirement to include “testifying at regulatory hearings” as the third Required Enterprise Service, but requests that the Commission clarify this matter.

Moreover, there is no information regarding what entity(ies) should be billed by the NANPA to cover the cost of the presumed Required Enterprise Services required to be provided to state regulators. It would be helpful if the Requirements Document specifically identified what entity(ies) is/are responsible for payment of the incurred NANPA costs of these Required Enterprise Services, so there is no difficulty in adhering to this mandate in the future. The requirements should specify NANPA’s duties and applicable cost recovery mechanisms if NANPA personnel are subpoenaed by a State to testify, even if the entity designated to pay for the enterprise service declines to provide such payment.

The above-referenced paragraphs describe both an interface requirement that is “national” in scope (standard NRUF data reports) and another that is specifically identified as being local and unique in scope (testifying at regulatory hearings), which, apparently, qualifies it as an Enterprise Service. There appear to be at least two related requirements in the Requirements Document that also have scopes similar to provision of testimony, which is a Required Enterprise Service, but it is unclear how these requirements are to be treated. The last paragraph of Section 2.17.5 requires that the “NANPA shall also be responsible for interfacing

with the regulatory authorities in person, when requested by such authority” and that such “meetings may be educational or informational depending on the circumstances and issues identified.” Additionally, Section 7.18.4 requires that the NANPA “shall be capable of responding to a request by a regulator for assistance and/or advice on a numbering issue that may affect existing processes and procedures used today by clients in managing NANP resources.” Both of these requirements mandate that the NANPA provide unique and potentially varying consulting-type services to State Regulatory Commissions. The frequency, scope, and variety of such requests for meetings and advice will vary among State Commissions, as will the requests to testify at regulatory hearings.

The FCC should clarify whether these services are part of the national requirements or a required enterprise service. If deemed to be part of the national requirements, certain limits should be considered as to the frequency of such events to allow bidders to adequately scope the effort involved in fulfilling the requirement. For example, Telcordia believes that there will be some requirements for travel in complying with State Regulatory Commission support activities. If these services are deemed to be enterprise services, the support including identification of payee should be included in Section 11 of the Requirements Document including identification of a payee for the services.

Several other aspects of the interface with state regulators should be clarified. Section 2.13.1 requires that the “NANPA shall provide State Commissions ‘limited’ password-protected access to the CO Code administration database.” It is not clear what the specific limitations of such access might be. Paragraphs 133-135 of the Third Report and Order provide some clarification. Further detailed specification on the authorized “limited” access within the

Requirements Document would prevent future misunderstandings between the NANPA and the State Commissions.

Audits

Section 2.11 of the Requirements Document contains requirements of the NANPA with regard to audits, both “For Cause” and “Other.” However, there is no reference in this Section to potential requests for NANPA assistance in audits of Service Providers by State Regulatory Commissions. In the FCC’s Third Report and Order, State Commissions were not delegated the authority to perform audits under the national audit program, but the FCC allowed for State Commissions to perform audits under State law.⁸ Telcordia sees the potential for such local audits and would prefer to have this potential referenced in the Requirements Document since there may be a requirement for the NANPA to participate in them to some extent. If the NANPA is, indeed, required to support such local audits, we believe that the Commission should determine whether they are to be treated as Enterprise Services or as a requirement for the national contract. If they are to be treated as an enterprise service, this should be included in Section 11 of the Requirements Document, including a directive as to the payee for the service.

In sum, Telcordia recommends that the FCC clarify in the Requirements Document exactly which services that the NANPA is required to supply to state regulators, and which of these are intended to be enterprise services. All such enterprise services should be added specifically to the enterprise service section of the Requirements Document, and a payee for those services should be explicitly identified. Where such services are not identified as enterprise services, the FCC should provide additional detail regarding limits to the services so that bidders can adequately determine the scope of the work to be performed. Finally, if the

⁸ *Numbering Resource Optimization*, Third Report and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 252 at para. 101 (2001).

solicitation will be for a cost-based contract, the FCC will need to explain how reasonable commercial rates for the enterprise services will be performed under the contract vehicle.

Appendix A provides section-by-section comments where changes could be made.

IV. System-to-System Requirements

Critical to system design is a clear understanding of how the system must interface with users and other systems. Some additional clarity regarding certain interfaces is necessary to the bidding process.

For example, Section 2.17.4 - Interface with Service Providers, notes that:

Any or all of the following interfaces also may be necessary, depending on the particular service provider with which interaction is taking place: system-to-system (FTP), web site, e-mail, facsimile, and U.S. Mail. For example, these interfaces shall be used to receive requests and to send assignments. It is also used for NRUF form submissions and to return a confirmation receipt to the service provider after an application and/or form has been accepted by the NANPA system for processing. NANPA is responsible for ensuring the availability of the interface.

This section speaks generically about a number of different types of interfaces, and then speaks generically about a few different circumstances in which interfaces will be required. It does not, however, specify which interfaces must be provided for each circumstance. Because the provision of such interfaces can be costly, appropriate pricing of bids necessitates that the required interfaces be identified with precision. As noted in section I, above, the Commission should require the current NANPA to make available detailed information about its current systems, including interfaces, and incorporate this information in the solicitation document. Once this information is available to bidders, the Commission will more easily be able to identify the circumstances in which bidders must match existing NANPA interfaces, as well as any circumstances in which the Commission wishes to increase (or decrease) existing interface capabilities. Only with this information will bidders be able to price their bids intelligently.

Similarly, Section 7.1 - System Characteristics, notes:

The NANPA system shall utilize standard electronic commerce type functionality that allows efficient client user interaction and data file transfer.
Data file transfer shall be simple and easy to understand.

This too implies an interface, but this interface does not appear to be strictly a system-to-system interface, but one that uses an undefined “standard electronic commerce type” functionality. Telcordia seeks further clarification as to what is required of this interface. The referenced sentence implies that the functionality will require “data file transfer,” which is a functionality of an FTP interface as referenced in 2.17.4. However, FTP is not usually used for “electronic commerce” in the sense of data entry for a purchase via the internet. The latter interface usually employs direct data entry into a web browser, commonly using Secure Socket Layer (SSL) encryption technology.

The Requirements Document seems in some sections to make a system-to-system interface a requirement, and in other sections seems to make an interface optional. Section 7.4.3 – Automated Submittal, states:

Except as noted, the NANPA system shall offer a web interface and/or allow for automated data input via EFT for applications and data forecast reports, as well as support an email attachment transfer capability.

The EFT capability shall permit clients to forward data in a predetermined format, which the NANPA shall then use to initiate processing within the NANP administration system(s).

The use of “and/or” implies that the system may use a web interface or allow for automated system-to-system functionality via “EFT.” It would be helpful if the Commission would clarify whether the EFT functionality is expected to be an FTP function, as it is referenced in most other sections, and whether support of EFT/FTP for any or all NANP resources is in fact required (as most sections seem to indicate), or optional (as this section seems to imply). The uncertainty is further exemplified by the fact that the very next section (Section 7.4.4 - Automated Data Output) immediately goes back to language implying that the system-to-system interface is required: “NANPA shall also accommodate automated data output via EFT to clients

when transmitting responses to clients per the appropriate industry guideline and other industry forms/data or reports.”

In addition to the FTP issue, Section 7.4.3 - Automated Submittal, notes:

NANPA shall use the data interface protocols previously adopted and in use between service providers and the current NANPA vendor.

This section seems to require the new vendor to use data interface protocols used by the previous vendor. There seems to be a conflict here since, as noted above, there is also a requirement for a system-to-system interface using FTP. To the best of our knowledge, there is no such protocol in use today in the current vendor’s Code Administration System (CAS). The only use of FTP for input to NANPA today is for the NRUF Reports. In addition, as noted in Section III of these comments, substantial additional information regarding the existing vendor’s systems is required to formulate a meaningful bid. The only NeuStar NANPA Center Code Administration System (CAS) Requirements Specification that is publicly available (version 4.3s) does not describe adequately the Graphical User Interface employed by the current vendor. Instead the document merely notes that the “exact set of GUI windows, the information they contain, and the functions they provide access to are still to be determined. This will be specified in a later version of this document.”⁹ Additionally, that document does not specify any protocol that is to be used between the web-based GUIs and the database, nor does it describe the database functionality or other system interfaces. Instead of limiting bidders to current data interface protocols, the FCC should clearly permit bidders an opportunity to provide, or at a minimum not prohibit, a new or upgraded system that improves on the current system via improved data technology and interfaces.

⁹ NeuStar NANPA Center Code Administration System (CAS) Requirements Specification, version 4.3s, page 100.

By implementing changes to the Requirements as suggested herein, Telcordia believes, the Commission will provide enough clarification to enable bidders to propose the most effective and innovative interface solutions for the new NANPA..

V. Section-by-Section Comments

Set forth below are additional comments and recommendations on the individual sections of the requirements document that do *not* pertain to the four broad issues in Sections I-IV. Specific comments that *do* pertain to the four broad issues are set out in Appendix A.

Section 1 General Requirements notes that “the scope of this document encompasses a national contract that is defined by FCC rules, FCC orders, state regulatory directives made under FCC delegated authority, and industry guidelines.”

Telcordia Comment: The term “encompasses” in this context seems inappropriate. It could imply that the Requirements Document would improperly override applicable solicitation or FAR terms.

Section 2.3.3 Numbering Resource Optimization states that the “NANPA shall coordinate resource activities with the Canadian Number Administrator and other NANP member countries’ administrators to ensure efficient and effective management of NANP numbering resources”.

Telcordia Comment: Telcordia is not aware of any current policy among the various NANP-served countries that provides authority to the NANPA to “ensure” the efficient and effective management of NANP numbering resources by these foreign administrations. Consistent with international comity, it would be more appropriate to substitute “promote” for

“ensure.” Furthermore, it is unclear whether this is a new authorization involving new NANPA activities that are, at present, undefined, and Telcordia recommends that this be clarified.

Section 2.4 Cost Allocation states: “NANPA shall determine the final allocation methodology for sharing costs between NANP countries in accordance with the Billing and Collection Agent Requirements Document, or appropriate regulatory documentation. Should cost allocation disputes arise, NANPA shall request NANC guidance. NANPA, in no circumstances, decides on its own the cost methodology or allocation between and among NANP member countries.”

Telcordia Comment: The first and last sentences of this paragraph appear to contradict each other. The first states that the NANPA determines the allocation methodology for sharing costs between NANP countries, while the last sentence states, “NANPA, in no circumstances, decides on its own the cost methodology or allocation between and among NANP member countries. It is Telcordia’s understanding that the latter statement is current policy. Is a policy change intended? If the first statement is intended to reflect a change, what procedures are to be used by the NANPA to “determine the final allocation methodology”?”

Section 2.6 Telecommunications Requirements notes that “NANPA shall maintain access to routing and rating databases (*e.g.*, Routing Database System [RDBS] and Business Rating Input Database System [BRIDS]¹⁰). This can be accomplished through dial-up access. NANPA shall also have access to the information contained in the Local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG) or an equivalent.”

Telcordia Comment: For clarification purposes, it should be noted that RDBS and BRIDS were combined last year into the Telcordia™ Business Integrated Routing and Rating Database System (BIRRDS). The Telcordia™ LERG™ Routing Guide is an output product of

¹⁰ RDBS/BRIDS is a Telcordia system that the industry uses to provide input access to the LERG. The LERG is the Local Exchange Routing Guide that contains the rating and routing information for assigned CO Codes.

BIRRDS used as the industry source for routing information; the Telcordia TPM™ Data Source is also an output product of BIRRDS used as an industry source for rating information.¹¹

Section 2.6 Telecommunications Requirements further notes: “NANPA shall maintain access to situation specific Number Portability Administration Center (NPAC) data. The data shall be obtained from the NPAC administrator per the details defined by the North American Portability Management, Limited Liability Corporation (LLC) that oversees the vendor of the local number portability systems and administration or as otherwise provided by FCC requirements.”

Telcordia Comment: The use of “situation specific” data is not clear in this context. We assume that this is a reference to the report on ported numbers or pending port information for CO codes that are being disconnected. In order for a vendor to be able to accurately provide cost estimates to the Commission in response to this requirement, the LLC should provide information on the costs of the reports. If our assumption is incorrect, a vendor would need more specific information with regard to this requirement.

Section 2.11.2 Other Audits of Service Providers notes: “NANPA shall be required to provide specific data to an auditor in order to facilitate the audit of a service provider. Routinely there are four audits per quarter.”

Telcordia Comment: Telcordia notes that there is an outstanding Public Notice on the scope of the Commission’s audit program and, as such, there is some uncertainty as to the scope of the NANPA’s role in support of that program. Further, as noted in the main comment section, the requirements do not make clear the NANPA’s role in support of a state commission audit performed under the state jurisdiction. It would be helpful to clarify if such support is a requirement of NANPA or an enterprise service and to clarify the scope of such support.

¹¹ Telcordia, LERG Routing Guide and TPM Data Source are trademarks of Telcordia Technologies, Inc.

Section 2.12 Dispute Resolution states: “NANPA shall interpret and apply relevant guidelines, directives, and Orders, including the use of the *Binder of Decisional Principals* [sic] to resolve a disagreement when assigning or denying the assignment of a number resource. When resolving misunderstandings between NANP members, NANPA shall notify the NANC of the issue and relevant documents used in the resolution attempt.”

Telcordia Comment: The version of the Binder of Decisional Principles referenced does not include the latest versions of FCC Number Resource Optimization Orders, INC, NIIF and other industry guidelines, nor does it include reference to any state decisions in matters where numbering authority has been delegated to them by the FCC. Telcordia assumes that bidders’ proposals should reference the latest documentation available at the time of publication of the solicitation.

Section 2.13.1 Limited Access states, “NANPA shall provide state commissions limited password-protected access to the CO Code administration database.”

Telcordia Comment: A further explanation of the extent of the limit for state access should be specific so that there is no misunderstanding between NANPA and state regulators as to the access NANPA should provide.

Section 2.13.2 Physical Security states, “NANPA shall ensure that any data requested by a non-NANPA entity is protected as confidential by that entity through applicable law or other documented nondisclosure mechanism.”

Telcordia Comment: This requirement should be modified because a vendor cannot “ensure” that any data provided to a non-NANPA entity is in fact protected. It can only ensure that a non-disclosure agreement, order, or statute is in place. Furthermore, this should be limited to *confidential* data that is “requested by a non-NANPA entity.” Not all data that might be requested needs to be treated as confidential.

Section 2.13.3 Site Visits states: “The FCC, with or without notice to NANPA, shall have the right to make visits to NANP administration and data centers to review safety/security requirements . . . Inspections shall include, but not be limited to, subcontractor facilities, telecommuting employees of NANPA or subcontractors, NANPA or subcontractor maintenance organizations, or individuals on traveling status with access to NANPA’s systems.”

Telcordia Comment: Site visits to a telecommuting employee’s home should not be made without notice, as this might otherwise be unreasonable. In lieu of such visits, the Commission could require the vendor to provide copies of its telecommuting policies and information on the security of remote access to its systems for telecommuting employees. The Commission could additionally require that any confidential information stored in a telecommuting or traveling employee’s residence be kept in a locked compartment. At the very least, if this requirement is deemed to be necessary, there should be prior notice of such visits.

Section 2.14 Implementation Plan states: “NANPA shall provide an Implementation Plan to the FCC within 30 days of contract award. The objective of this Implementation Plan shall be to achieve a seamless continuance of NANPA services across Terms of Administration.”

Telcordia Comment: A vendor will be better able to understand this requirement if the Commission specifies topics that are required in the “Implementation Plan” by providing a “Data Item Description (DID).” Further, as was explained in Section II, above, absent immediate and full disclosure by the current NANPA regarding which software and hardware components will be transferred, as well as full documentation such as that described in Section 7.16, it may be difficult or infeasible to meet this requirement.

Section 2.15 NANP Transition to Successor states, “This NANPA transfer is additionally subject to the termination and continuity provisions in Section H.”

Telcordia Comment: Section H cannot be found in the Requirements Document. We ask that the Commission clarify this reference.

Section 2.15.4 Transition Plan states: “NANPA shall, 180 calendar days prior to contract termination, provide a detailed plan for an efficient and orderly transition. This transition plan shall follow the format, as applicable, of Reference 24, *Software Transition Plan (STrP)*.”

Telcordia Comment: This is one of several documents Telcordia could not locate at the referenced website for this set of comments, as noted in comments below in the List of References section. Further, it appears that “Reference 24” should be “Reference 28.”

Section 2.17.3 Interface With the Number Portability Administration states, “The interface shall be used to request information from the NPAC about NXXs that are about to be reclaimed by NANPA to ensure that there are no ported TNs contained with the NXX targeted for reclamation.”

Telcordia Comment: The current interface (a one-time snapshot) is inadequate to “ensure” that there are not ported TNs contained within the NXX at the time it is disconnected. The INC is currently addressing improvement to this process as INC Issue 364. It is suggested that the requirement be edited to reflect that the NANPA is required to follow the most current guideline or regulatory directives for this situation.

Section 4.1 Requirements states: “NANPA, in order to perform CO Code Administration functions, shall maintain considerable knowledge of local/regional environments including geography, demographics, growth patterns, local dialing plans, and eligibility requirements. This knowledge shall be applied to each CO Code assignment. Local conditions for each NPA shall be posted to the NANPA web site.”

Telcordia Comment: It is requested that the Commission provide clarification of the term “local conditions” to be posted to the website. Currently, only the local dialing plans for

each NPA are posted, but the text of this paragraph seems to imply that considerable additional information may be required.

Section 4.2.1 Client Services states: “NANPA shall educate its clients. Such education may include, but is not limited to, providing client job aides and providing necessary forms and instructions on the NANPA web site.”

Telcordia Comment: The scope of this requirement is unclear. Specifically, the inclusion of the phrase “not limited to” the scope of the duties of the NANPA with regard to client education is unclear. Will the NANPA be required, for example, to travel to give tutorials to clients to meet this requirement? The Commission should provide detail with regard to the duties contemplated under this requirement.

Section 4.2.2 Processing notes that

NANPA shall:

- Verify that no ported TNs are working in a CO Code prior to disconnection
- Use the NPAC Ported TN Report provided by NPAC.
- Review all Part 1’s requesting a change or a disconnect of a code to ascertain if ported TNs are present and, if so, deny the Part 1 disconnect and order all disconnect activities to cease immediately
- Comply with the INC guidelines addressing “Information Changes” and “Code Holder Responsibilities.”

Telcordia Comment: As noted above, the current process takes a snapshot NPAC report one time prior to disconnect, and if ported TNs or pending ports are found at that particular time, a new assignee is sought. However, if no ports are found at that time, but a customer schedules a port later in the process, NANPA has no way of knowing this, using current interfaces. As noted above, it is suggested that the requirement might be revised to reflect NANPA’s duty to follow current INC processes and regulatory directives. This requirement is unnecessary for “change”

type applications. There is no reason to request a report from the NPAC for change applications. Finally, NANPA cannot comply with “Code Holder Responsibilities”; at most NANPA can attempt to verify, whenever possible, that the code holder complies with those responsibilities. NANPA can comply with the Administrator Responsibilities and other clear reference to NANPA responsibilities in INC Guidelines.

Section 4.2.2 Processing also notes: “If the applicant is unable to satisfy the requirements for receiving a CO Code or provide NANPA with sufficient information, NANPA shall deny the application and return it to the applicant. Applications denied as a result of rationing plans shall be held for subsequent monthly lotteries or assignments; applicants shall not be forced to re-file complete applications, but only to update information if necessary. Prior to each lottery drawing, NANPA shall contact service providers with applications on file due to a rationing plan to verify that applicants still have a need for the resource”

Telcordia Comment: Contacting each SP to check if they want to keep their application could be very burdensome, should the requirement simply refer to NANPA responsibilities for Jeopardy Procedures in the INC Guidelines. The requirement is not needed since the applicant always bears the responsibility of withdrawing its application if it is no longer needed.

Section 4.4 Resource Reclamation states, “NANPA shall send an e-mail confirmation in response to every CO Code application received.”

Telcordia Comment: It would seem that this requirement is not needed for web-based or FTP applications. For web based applications and most FTP based systems, a confirmation of a submission is available, so e-mail confirmation of receipt should be unnecessary.

Section 5.1.15 Implementation Assistance states that “If the state regulatory authorities have not ordered an NPA relief plan on or before the industry requested approval date, NANPA shall notify the FCC and the NANC in writing and provide the date by which an order is required to avoid jeopardizing the timely implementation of NPA relief.

Telcordia Comment: Can this requirement be fulfilled via the NPA Relief Activity Status Report? The requirement regarding when an order is necessary to avoid jeopardizing implementation requires information best obtained from local industry. INC and NIIF guidelines require six months industry notification of an NPA change. Any period less than that would be non-standard, and only local industry has the knowledge to determine if they are capable of implementing the relief in a shorter period of time.

Section 5.1.16 Compliance states: NANPA shall:

- Comply with CO Code (NXX) Assignment Guidelines and NPA Code Relief Planning Guidelines

Telcordia Comment: It is suggested that the NPA Allocation Plan and Assignment Guidelines be added to this requirement since NPA relief disposition involves assignment of a new NPA.

Section 6.1.5 Data Analysis states: “NANPA shall compare actual NPA exhaust and current exhaust forecasts with the past five exhaust projections. NANPA shall summarize the accuracy of its forecast outlining (1) contributing factors, (2) changes required, (3) the outcome if no change is made, (4) the parties who shall participate in the changes, and (5) a description of the activity each party shall take to realize the desired outcome.”

Telcordia Comment: Telcordia requests clarification of the requirement to summarize the accuracy of exhaust of the NANP or an NPA, if exhaust has not yet occurred. In addition, it is unclear what “changes” are referred to in the list of elements to be summarized.

Section 6.1.10 Penalties for Non-Submission states, “If an NRUF Report has not been submitted by a service provider, NANPA shall withhold future numbering requests from that service provider within the area for which the NRUF data has not been supplied.

Telcordia Comment: Please provide clarification of the term “the area”; is the reference to rate area or NPA?

Section 6.3.1.2 Historical CO Code Assignment Data states that “the historical CO Code data includes NXX code assignments over the two years immediately preceding the date of the NRUF for all industry segments, *e.g.*, Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier (ILEC), Competitive Local Exchange Carrier (CLEC), two-way Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) Carrier, and Paging Carrier.

Telcordia Comment: This requirement presumes transfer of such data from the incumbent NANPA for analysis against current data. Also, the requirement should not limit such analysis to two years but should require that a minimum of two years historical data be included in an analysis.

Section 7.1.1 System Availability states, “any contractor-defined new NANP administration system or system upgrade shall be available within six months of contract award.”

Telcordia Comment: Six months is an extremely short development cycle for the number of new features being requested by the government from the existing system as it is known to the public. If all needed the details of the current system, as noted in Section II of our comments, are not made available in advance to all bidders, only the incumbent will be able to reasonably and fairly assess the effort for upgrades in advance of the development effort.

Section 7.1.1 System Availability states, “The NANPA system shall be seamlessly available for input, processing, and downloads during clients’ normal business hours.”

Telcordia Comment: What does “seamlessly” mean in the context of this section?

Section 7.4.1 Data Integrity states, “NANPA shall ensure that all data stored is accurate and take whatever steps are necessary to confirm that data processed is so.”

Telcordia Comment: Steps can be taken to help ensure that only accurate information is entered when the data being entered can be built into a table for the system to verify against; such data must be available to the contractor. The phrase “whatever steps necessary” is too unbounded. We suggest this be changed to “commercially reasonable steps.”

Section 7.6 System Security states, “NANPA shall maintain and enforce system safety and physical security procedures in accordance with the *FCC Computer Security Program* (Reference 21).” .

Telcordia Comment: This is one of several documents Telcordia could not locate at the referenced website for this set of comments, as noted in comments below in the List of References section. Further, it appears that this document should be Reference 25.

Section 7.6 also states, “Following contract award, NANPA shall prepare a NANPA Security Plan following, as appropriate, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) *Guide for Developing Security Plans for Information Technology Systems* (Reference 26).”

Telcordia Comment: This is one of several documents Telcordia could not locate at the referenced website for this set of comments, as noted in comments below in the List of References section. Further, it appears that this document should be Reference 30.

Section 7.7.6 Logon System Problems states: “Users experiencing problems in obtaining a logon ID shall contact the NANPA for resolution. The NANPA shall resolve all logon problems within one business day.

Telcordia Comment: Resolution within one business day may not always be reasonable if the logon problems are caused due to outside circumstances such as the internet connection or firewall settings of the party logging on. The requirement would be more reasonable if NANPA were required to make all reasonable efforts to resolve log-on problems within one business day.

7.12 System Testing states, “The System Test Plan shall follow the format, where applicable, of Reference 22, *IEEE Standard for Software Test Documentation*. ”

Telcordia Comment: This is one of several documents Telcordia could not locate at the referenced website for this set of comments, as noted in comments below in the List of References section. Further, it appears that this document should be Reference 26.

Section 7.13 System Disaster Recovery states, “NANPA shall develop and implement a detailed Disaster/Continuity of Operations Plan, following the format, where applicable, of Reference 23, *NFPA 1600 Standard on Disaster/Emergency Management and Business Continuity Programs*. ”

Telcordia Comment: This is one of several documents Telcordia could not locate at the referenced website for this set of comments, as noted in comments below in the List of References section. Further, it appears that this document should be Reference 27.

Section 7.16 System Documentation states, “This documentation should be consistent with Reference 25, *IEEE Standard for Software User Documentation*. ”

Telcordia Comment: This is one of several documents Telcordia could not locate at the referenced website for this set of comments, as noted in comments below in the List of References section. Further, it appears that this document should be Reference 29.

Section 7.19.5 System Responsiveness states, “If a user is experiencing greater than 12 seconds to view the complete home page, the NANPA system shall have the capability to sense this condition.”

Telcordia Comment: It is unreasonable to expect the system to be able to determine the time to view the home page for an individual connected to the public internet. And, even if it were reasonable, many of the factors affecting that user’s ability to display the page would be

outside the control of the vendor e.g., internet or network congestion on the connecting individual's network. The requirement should be revised to state that the home page should be designed such that it can be downloaded for display in a certain time at a certain connection speed. That will de-facto place limits on the contents of that page.

Section 7.19.6 Out-of-Service states: "the NANPA web site shall be operational 99.9% of the time over any 12-month period, excluding scheduled maintenance. NANPA's inability to deliver services to this level shall be deemed 'out of service.' This figure excludes problems due to the customer's network or equipment."

Telcordia Comment: While this requirement properly removes responsibility from the vendor for out-of-service conditions due to the "customer's network or equipment," it is suggested that the exclusion does not go far enough. It should exclude any out-of-service conditions caused outside of the NANPA's network and equipment.

Section 8.6 Requests for Additional Reports states: "NANPA may also be requested to produce additional reports as needed by its clients. NANPA may create and provide data in different formats to accommodate requests to cull data and provide customized reports for a fee that is reasonable and based on its costs. See Section H."

Telcordia Comment: Section H cannot be found in the requirements document. Is provision of the Additional Reports intended to be an Enterprise Service? If it is, it should be referenced as such and included in the Enterprise Service Section of the requirements.

Section 9.1 Audit by FCC states, "the NANPA shall be subject to audits by the FCC or its designees"

Telcordia Comment: Because audits disrupt business processes and increase costs, there should be a limit on the number of times per year this audit will be performed. The limit, and whether the audit is random or scheduled, should be specified.

Section 9.1.3 Audit Results states: “NANPA shall make audit results available to the public in a limited manner that protects any confidential information. The NANC shall receive a detailed summary of the audit results such that the content shall not identify any service provider.”

Telcordia Comment: Although it is not mentioned in the requirements, Telcordia assumes that the Commission will have access to the full audit results. What access will state regulators have, and who will provide that access?

Section 9.2.3 Performance Problems and Corrective Action states, “NANPA shall implement remedial action, at no cost to its clients, to correct any identified performance problems.”

Telcordia Comment: The requirement to provide all remedial action of performance problems at no cost is overly broad. The requirement should be limited to implementation at no cost for any remedial changes to implement the contract requirements, and which are not a change in scope as defined by the contract.

Section 10.7 Contract Change Management Plan states, “the contractor shall provide a Contract Change Management Plan per Section 2.11 within 90 days of contract award.”

Telcordia Comment: There is no reference to this plan in the requirements. Section 2.11 is audits, and Section 2.10, which seems appropriate, does not reference such a plan.

Section 11 Enterprise Services states: “Enterprise services are additional services that may be implemented, for a specific fee, by NANPA. These are described as services that NANPA can provide but are limited to meeting the needs of a limited number of clients.” And, **Section 11.1 Operating Principles** states, “The fees associated with enterprise services shall be fair and reasonable.”

Telcordia Comment: If the solicitation will be for a cost-based contract, the FCC will need to explain how reasonable commercial rates for the enterprise services will be performed under the contract vehicle.

Section 11.4 Changes to Scope of Work states: “The NANPA vendor may request additional funding for services that are a change in scope from the functions, requirements identified within this document. The NANPA will follow the process as identified in Section 14.1 to seek additional funding to cover the costs associated with providing added services to its client.”

Telcordia Comment: There is no Section 14.1 of this Requirements Document. And the Requirements Document does not address this subject in any other section.

List of References

Telcordia Comment: Telcordia has not been able to find all of the references that are listed, and notes that many of them have been replaced by more recent versions. Telcordia suggests that the requirements should reference the most recent version of the document as of solicitation publication, and suggests that the FCC put a copy of each most recent version in the FCC reference room for potential commenters and bidders to have access to the documents. Finally, Telcordia notes that in several cases the references to specific documents in the main sections of the Technical Requirements sometimes refer to incorrect numbers on this list.

Index to the Binder of Decisional Principles

Telcordia Comment: As noted above, it would be helpful if this document were updated to include the most recent version of all FCC orders and guidelines, to avoid confusion. In addition it notes that ATIS has added a new forum, the IMSI Oversight Council (IOC),- with which the NANPA may have to interface. Finally, it should be noted that the Binder does not contain any references to state proceedings where they have been granted relevant authority by the FCC.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Telcordia recommends that the Technical Requirements be modified in accordance with its foregoing Comments.

Respectfully submitted,

TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES

Louise L. M. Tucker
Attorney for Telcordia Technologies
2020 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 530-8934
ltucker@telcordia.com

Dated: July 2, 2002

Appendix A

The following are section-by-section comments on the four crucial issues discussed in Sections II through IV of our Comments. Telcordia is providing these section-by-section comments to demonstrate how pervasive those four issues are, and to identify a section-by-section recommended remedy.

Section 1.3 Background notes that “there shall be a transition from the current administrator to the new administrator should the NANPA responsibility be awarded to a new party.”

Telcordia Comment: As noted in the main comments, there is no discussion of what systems or other property will be provided to the contractor in the transition per Section 52.13 of FCC rules. A successor contractor is significantly handicapped in responding to the Solicitation using the requirements described and the documents referenced without significant further clarification regarding which elements of the current NANPA system and other intellectual property will be transferred to a successor contractor, and under what terms and conditions.

Section 1.5.3 Industry Activities states that “industry guidelines and regulatory directives are subject to change throughout NANPA’s Term of Administration.”

Telcordia Comment: As noted in the main comments, the Requirements Document would benefit from additional clarification of the process for the NANPA to incorporate industry and regulatory driven changes in its scope of work including the process for a change in scope to the contract.

Section 2.9 Travel states, “NANPA staff shall travel, when necessary, to meet the needs of NANPA (*e.g.*, NANC, INC, NPA jeopardy situations, NPA relief planning meetings, or as otherwise necessary to comply with FCC requirements).”

Telcordia Comment: As noted in our main comment section, it would be helpful to state specifically the requirement for travel in response to maintenance of the interface with state regulators including whether the cost of such travel is meant to be a required service or an enterprise service.

Section 2.10 Modification of Guidelines states: “NANPA shall participate in the development and modification of guidelines and procedures, which may affect the performance of NANPA functions. These changes may come from regulatory directives and/or modifications to guidelines. In addition, new guidelines may be developed as appropriate to comply with regulatory directives. NANPA shall adopt and implement any changes that are consistent with regulatory directives when they are officially released, recognizing that some may constitute a change in the scope of work.”

Telcordia Comment: The main comments address this issue. This language implies that the vendor adopt a change before a Change in Scope is approved by the FCC or appropriate system changes can be made in the NANPA system. It would help if the two types of changes, regulatory and industry, were separated and the change process for each were discussed. Many of the directives for NANPA in the later part of this section seem to be applicable to industry driven changes but not necessarily for regulation changes.

Section 2.17.4 Interface With the Service Providers states:
The SP interface shall be used to receive NANP resource applications and to send assignments, in a relay between the NANPA and a service provider.

Any or all of the following interfaces also may be necessary, depending on the particular service provider with which interaction is taking place: system-to-system (FTP), web site, e-mail, facsimile, and U.S. Mail.

Telcordia Comment: As noted in the main comments, references to a system-to-system (FTP) interface appear inconsistently in the Requirements Document. A clear requirement as to the provision of this interface is necessary. The current NeuStar CAS does not provide this

interface. Thus, it is vital to know if an FTP interface is to be an optional interface, as a later section implies, or is it a required interface. Furthermore, significant additional information needs to be made available to competing bidders about the current CAS system so that all parties, and not just the incumbent, can meaningfully propose upgrades to the current system.



Section 2.17.5 Interface With the Regulatory Agencies states:

NANPA may be called upon to testify in regulatory hearings. In these cases NANPA shall ensure that its testimony is specific to the scope and requirements of this contract. Any costs associated with testifying in regulatory hearings shall be treated as enterprise services.

NANPA shall also be responsible for interfacing with regulatory authorities in person, when requested by such authority. The nature of these meetings may be educational or informational depending on the circumstances and issues identified.

Telcordia Comment: The duties in these two paragraphs should be clarified. Testimony at hearings seems to be an enterprise service, but it is not covered under the Enterprise Services in Section 11. Additionally, it is not clear who would be responsible to pay for the service if it is an enterprise service. If NANPA is subpoenaed to testify, it may have to incur the expenses of testimony even if the entity identified to pay for the enterprise service refused to pay for such. Further, the effort of interfacing with the state authority seems to be unlimited, and it is not clear whether the Commission intends this too to be an enterprise service. If the testimony required by a state commission is “educational or informational” in nature, under which requirement does the effort fit? A vendor should be able to limit its visits to a state PUC location for the purpose of information or educational exchanges in order to properly scope the effort of this requirement.

Section 4.2.1 Client Services states: “NANPA shall notify its clients and interested parties when industry guidelines or applicable regulatory directives have changed. NANPA shall provide electronic notification of administrative process and procedural changes within five business days of the change being identified by NANPA. Implementation of these changes shall entail a transition period before the new process or procedure becomes effective.”

Telcordia Comment: Telcordia concerns with regard to Change Management are addressed more fully in the main comments section. The language of this particular section seems to conflict with that of Section 2.10 above that says change are to be effective when officially released for regulatory driven changes. The process of a transition for the effective date of changes makes sense from both and industry and administrative perspective but needs to correlate throughout the requirements. Further, it is not clear what entity (e.g., INC, NANC, FCC, NANPA) develops the process and milestones for the transition period.

Section 5.1.10 Possible Testimony states: “NANPA may be requested to provide testimony to the state regulatory authorities regarding the relief plan, as necessary. The cost for this service should be treated as an enterprise service.”

Telcordia Comment: As noted above, clarification should be provided to distinguish between required state commission support and support that is an enterprise service. It is worth noting again that support of state commissions does not appear in the Enterprise Service section of the Requirements Document, and it is unclear what entity would pay for this service.

Section 6.2 Development of Tests for Anomalies and Inconsistencies states: “NANPA shall examine the NRUF report submitted by each service provider for inconsistencies or anomalies. NANPA shall design the tests and algorithms that it shall use to test the utilization and forecast data submitted by service providers for forecast submissions prior to actually performing any tests. NANPA shall provide a detailed description of the actual methodology employed to identify inconsistencies and anomalies. The description shall include a list of all assumptions and rationale incorporated into the methodology tests, as well as any mathematical formulas that are used.”

Telcordia Comment: As noted in Section II of our comments, the current tests and algorithms should be made available to vendors for preparation of their proposals.

Section 7 Automated System Support states: “NANPA shall maintain a NANP administration system that is capable of supporting the requirements and functionality acknowledged within this document. In addition, the system shall be sized accordingly to support current and future resources and clients.”

Telcordia Comment: This is a very broad requirement. Each potential bidder needs to understand the current system software and hardware in order to assess what upgrades would be necessary to meet this requirement over the course of a five-year contract. Furthermore, it may be appropriate to adopt objective measures affecting sizing.

Section 7.4.3 Automated Submittal states, “NANPA shall use the data interface protocols previously adopted and in use between service providers and the current NANPA vendor.”

Telcordia Comment: As noted in Section IV above, the CAS requirements do not speak to the protocol being used and that more efficient protocols may be available. Rather, it is suggested that the current interfaces between the SP and NANPA should continue to have the same look and feel with any new or upgraded system.

Section 7.4.3 Automated Submittal states, “except as noted, the NANPA system shall offer a web interface and/or allow for automated data input via EFT for applications and data forecast reports, as well as support an email attachment transfer capability.”

Telcordia Comment: As noted in Section IV above, the use of the term “and/or” here is confusing. Section 2.17.4 and several other references in these comments seem to say that EFT/FTP IS a requirement that is not adequately stated by “and/or” here.

Section 7.18.4 Federal and State Directives/Orders states, “NANPA and/or a system application shall be capable of responding to a request by a regulator for assistance and/or advice on a numbering resource issue that may affect existing processes and procedures used today by clients in managing NANP resources.”

Telcordia Comment: Certain services provided to state regulators are noted as enterprise services. For each service required of NANPA to be provided to a state regulator, the Commission should be clear as to what is an enterprise service and what is a nationally required service. When such services are part of the national responsibilities of the NANPA, they should have commercially reasonable scope limitations.

Section 10.6 Change Management Plan states, “The contractor shall provide a Change Management Plan per Section 4.1 within 90 days of contract award.”

Telcordia Comment: As noted above, the requirements surrounding change management for guideline and regulatory driven changes require clarification for such a plan to be provided.

Section 11.2 Required Enterprise Service

Telcordia Comment Section 2.17.5 states that testifying at regulatory hearings should be charged as an Enterprise Service, but it is not clear whether it should it then be listed as item #3 in this Section. Additional Reports, while not called an enterprise service in Section 8.6, seem to be required to be treated as an enterprise service. It is not clear whether they should be included in this section, too. In addition, a payee would need to be noted for such service.